REMARKS

This is intended as a full and complete response to the Final Office Action dated April 07, 2006, having a shortened statutory period for response set to expire on July 07, 2006. Applicants submit this response to place the application in condition for allowance or in better form for appeal. Please reconsider the claims pending in the application for reasons discussed below.

Claims 1-4, 7, 9-15, 17, 19-26, 28 and 30-36 are pending in the application. Claims 1-4, 7, 9-15, 17, 19-26, 28 and 30-36 remain pending following entry of this response. Claims 14 and 31 have been amended. Claim 19 has been cancelled. Applicants submit that the amendments do not introduce new matter.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 14-15, 17 and 19-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement.

At least in the Final Office Action, the Examiner suggests that the addition of the word "tangible" to claim 14 amounts to the addition of new matter:

> Claim 14 includes the added limitation of "tangible", on line 1; the original disclosure of the application does not provide any definitions or support for "tangible computer readable medium."

Final Office Action, p. 2-3. However, in a prior Office Action, the Examiner pointed out that claim 14 was not limited to "tangible embodiments." Specifically, the prior Office Action provides:

> In view of Applicant's disclosure, specification pages 5-6, paragraph 0023, the medium is not limited to tangible embodiments, instead being defined as including both tangible embodiments (e.g., information permanently stored on no-writable storage media, i.e. CD-ROM) and intangible embodiments (e.g., signal bearing communication medium). As such, the claim is not limited to statutory subject matter and is therefore non-statutory as the claim is not tangible.

Office Action, p.3. Applicants fail to understand how the Examiner can believe paragraph 0023 is "defined as including ... tangible embodiments," yet at the same time

Page 8

470408_1

PAGE 9/13 * RCVD AT 6/7/2006 7:04:53 PM [Eastern Daylight Time] * SVR:USPTO-EFXRF-3/6 * DNIS:2738300 * CSID:7136234846 * DURATION (mm-ss):03-44

also believe that Applicants' addition of the world "tangible" to claim 14 amounts to the addition of new matter. Nevertheless, in the interest of moving prosecution forward, Applicants have amended claim 14 to be directed to a "computer readable storage medium." Accordingly, Applicants request that this rejection be withdrawn.

Claim 19 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 19 has been cancelled with this response.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-2, 4, 7, 12-15, 20, 25-26, 28 and 32-34 and 36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yen et al. U.S. Publication 2002/0054141 (hereinafter "Yen") and Hodgkinson U.S. Publication 2002/0016802.

Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

The Examiner bears the initial burden of establishing a *prima facie* case of obviousness. *See* MPEP § 2142. To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine the reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Third, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. *See* MPEP § 2143. The present rejection fails to establish at least the third criteria.

At a minimum, the combination of *Yen* in view of *Hodgkinson* fails to teach, show, or suggest a method for controlling a viewable browser window that includes opening a controlling browser window configured to control aspects of a controlled browser window, wherein the controlling browser window establishes at least one event handler prior to opening the controlled browser window. The combination further fails to

Page 9

470408 1

PAGE 10/13 * RCVD AT 6/7/2006 7:04:53 PM [Eastern Daylight Time] * SVR:USPTO-EFXRF-3/6 * DNIS:2738300 * CSID:7136234846 * DURATION (mm-ss):03-44

teach, show, or suggest opening the controlled browser window, wherein the controlled browser window includes a display area for rendering viewable content received from network locations, and wherein the controlling browser window controls at least one functional aspect of the controlled browser window during a browsing session engaged in by a user, as recited by claims 1, 14, 25 and 34.

In rejecting these claims, the Examiner relies on paragraphs 46-52 from *Yen*. These passages provide a description of a graphical user interface shown in *Yen* Figure 6A-6B that displays stock quotes. As shown, a button on a "first main window 46" is used to open a "first sub window display 52." Once the first sub window display 52" is opened, however, the "first main window 46" (which the Examiner asserts is analogous to the "controlling browser window" of the present claims) fails to control a "functional aspect of the controlled browser window" as recited by the present claims. Instead, the functional aspects of the "first sub window display 52" (which the Examiner asserts is analogous to the "controlled browser window") operate as intended. For example, the window in figure 6B includes "program function buttons" labeled 54a, 54b. See *Yen*, ¶ 50. The "first main window" does not control the functional aspects of these buttons. In other words, the "first main window 46" fails to exert any control, influence, or dominion over the "first sub window display 52."

Further, the combination of *Yen* and *Hodginkinson* fails to disclose a "controlling browser window" and "controlled browser window," configured to "receive[] user input to which the controlled browser window is configured to produce a predetermined response" and to "override[] the predetermined response by executing an action specified by the at least one event handler to cause a response different from the predetermined response," as recited by claims 1, 14, 25, and 34. The Examiner concedes that *Yen* fails to disclose these limitations, but suggests that the combination of *Yen* and *Hodginkinson* renders these limitations obvious. *Hodgkinson*, however, is directed to how a web page is rendered in response to a user request. When combined, with the graphical user interface *Yen* would continue to render information in the "first sub window display 52" in response to a user request without changing the

Page 10

470408_1

predetermined response. The combination might improve the quality of how the page is rendered to a user, but would not change the predetermined response of: rendering the page in response to a user selection of a page.

Further, the Examiner suggests that the combination of *Yen* and *Hodginkinson* would "provide a management system that keeps users from conducting harmful or unauthorized actions on data, maintaining data integrity and security." See Final Office Action, p. 6. However, *Yen* "provides a computer system for displaying multiple windows adjacently and simultaneously." See *Yen*, Abstract. And *Hodgkinson* "relates to the generation of user selected pages and the delay in the reformatting of the same following a user selection ... of a new page which is to be displayed. See *Hodgkinson*, Abstract. Both cases are directly related to how information is displayed, as such, these references alone, or combined, do not disclose any features at all related to a management system "that keeps users from conducting harmful or unauthorized actions on data, maintaining data integrity and security." Accordingly, Applicants submit that the suggested motivation to combine these references is fundamentally flawed.

Claims 3, 9-11, 17, 19, 21-24, 30-31 and 35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)[1] as being unpatentable over *Yen* in view of *Hodgkinson*, and further in view of Netscape® Communicator 4.75, copyright 2000 (hereinafter "Netscape"). Applicants traverse this rejection.

Claims 3, 9-11, 17, 19, 21-24, 30-31 and 35 depend from one of claims 1, 14, 25 and 34. Applicants believe that the above discussion demonstrates that claims 1, 14, 25 and 34 are patentable over *Yen* in view of *Hodgkinson*. Thus, Applicants believe a detailed discussion of the *Netscape* reference is unnecessary. Nevertheless, Applicants incorporate their remarks regarding the combination of *Yen*, *Hodgikinson* and *Netscape* made in the response filed on February 1, 2006 by reference.

---

[1] The Final Office Action reads: "Claims 3, 9-11, 17, 19, 21-24, 30-31 and 35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a)." Applicants assume 103(a) was intended.

Page 11

470408_1

PATENT
App. Ser. No.: 10/020,026
Atty. Dkt. No. ROC920010306US1
PS Ref. No.: IBMK10306

Conclusion

Having addressed all issues set out in the office action, Applicants respectfully submit that the claims are in condition for allowance and respectfully request that the claims be allowed.

If the Examiner believes any issues remain that prevent this application from going to issue, the Examiner is strongly encouraged to contact Gero McClellan, attorney of record, at (336) 643-3065, to discuss strategies for moving prosecution forward toward allowance.

Respectfully submitted, and
S-signed pursuant to 37 CFR 1.4,

/Gero G. McClellan, Reg. No. 44,227/
Gero G. McClellan
Registration No. 44,227
PATTERSON & SHERIDAN, L.L.P.
3040 Post Oak Blvd. Suite 1500
Houston, TX 77056
Telephone: (713) 623-4844
Facsimile: (713) 623-4846
Attorney for Applicants

Page 12

470408_1